

CHAPTER 3

WORKLOAD, CAPACITY, AND CAPACITY UTILIZATION

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides tables that depict, by depot, actual and projected workload, capacity, and depot capacity utilization trends over the period FY00-FY07. These figures reflect planned closures, interservicing, consolidations, and divestitures. The tables are comprised of three categories:

- Workload, which shows the amount of workload in direct labor hours (DLH) either executed or expected to be executed in a given fiscal year;
- Capacity Index, which shows the amount of workload in direct labor hours that the depot can effectively produce annually on a single shift, 40-hour week basis; and
- Utilization Index, which is a computation of dividing workload by capacity index.

Capacity and utilization data were requested to be computed in accordance with the DoD 4151.18-H, the *DoD Depot Maintenance Capacity and Utilization Handbook*, 24 January 1997, and its supplemental interim instructions issued 30 September 1999 and 4 October 2001, for all depot activities. Capacity data represents the total capacity at each depot, including reserve and excess capacity.

When appropriate, tables are followed by notes describing particular events effecting workload or capacity levels for those depots. These notes also provide explanations of any unusual fluctuations shown by the data in a given table.

3.2 DEPOT WORKLOAD, CAPACITY, AND CAPACITY UTILIZATION SUMMARY

3.2.1 Army

**Table 3-1. Anniston Army Depot (ANAD)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	2,424.1	2,602.0	2,884.0	2,915.0	2,819.0	2,731.0	2,502.0	2,047.0
Capacity	3,220.0	3,220.0	3,220.0	3,220.0	3,220.0	3,220.0	3,220.0	3,220.0
Capacity Utilization	75%	81%	90%	91%	88%	85%	78%	64%

**Table 3-2. Corpus Christi Army Depot (CCAD)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	2,865.0	2,847.0	2,864.0	2,864.0	2,864.0	2,864.0	2,864.0	2,864.0
Capacity	3,843.0	3,843.0	3,843.0	3,843.0	3,843.0	3,843.0	3,843.0	3,843.0
Capacity Utilization	75%	74%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%

Corpus Christi Army Depot overhauls and repairs rotary wing aircraft such as the AH-64 Apache, UH-60 Blackhawk and CH-47 Chinook helicopters. The workloads include H-1 and H-60 helicopters for the Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps.

**Table 3-3. Letterkenny Army Depot (LEAD)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	870.0	852.0	849.0	908.0	904.0	838.0	837.0	843.0
Capacity	1,174.0	1,153.0	1,153.0	1,153.0	1,153.0	1,153.0	1,153.0	1,153.0
Capacity Utilization	74%	74%	74%	79%	78%	73%	73%	73%

LEAD overhauls and repairs Army tactical missile ground support equipment and DoD tactical missile guidance and control systems. Included are Sparrow, Phoenix, Sidewinder and Maverick. FY01 was a transition year at LEAD. Some maintenance infrastructure transferred from Government ownership to the control of the Letterkenny Industrial Development Authority (LIDA). This resulted in a slight reduction in capacity from FY01 to FY02.

**Table 3-4. Red River Army Depot (RRAD)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	1,390.6	1,350.5	1,090.3	1,484.3	1,072.4	1,110.1	1,164.9	1,017.0
Capacity	1,598.3	1,850.0	1,848.0	1,855.4	1,849.0	1,850.2	1,849.0	1,849.0
Capacity Utilization	87%	73%	59%	80%	58%	60%	63%	55%

**Table 3-5. Tobyhanna Army Depot (TYAD)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	2,917.0	2,850.0	2,747.0	2,615.0	2,615.0	2,615.0	2,615.0	2,615.0
Capacity	3,765.0	3,650.0	3,650.0	3,650.0	3,650.0	3,650.0	3,650.0	3,650.0
Capacity Utilization	77%	78%	75%	72%	72%	72%	72%	72%

Workload totals decreased slightly from the executed level in FY01 to the budgeted FY02 figure. This decrease was primarily due to a decrease in overall communications electronics funding in order to recapitalize systems out of the communications electronics commodity. Workload totals drop off into FY03 and then remains fairly constant through FY08.

After a period of carrying additional capacity during the transfer of incoming 1995 Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) workloads from Sacramento Air Logistics Center, the depot has adjusted the capacity to match the final workload mix. With the exception of some adjustments that may be necessary for Army recapitalization workloads, it is expected that TYAD will maintain a similar workload mix through the outyears and therefore carry a similar capacity profile.

**Table 3-6. Software Engineering Center (SEC) CECOM, Ft. Monmouth, NJ
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	446.1	496.4	411.1	640.3	656.9	653.1	653.3	649.4

Post production software support is not performed at a major depot activity but is accomplished at the SEC at Ft. Monmouth. The outyear President's Budget Guidance (PBG) has increased significantly since the last Business Profile, which has caused DLHs to increase significantly starting in FY04.

3.2.2 Naval Air Systems Command

**Table 3-7. Naval Air Depot Cherry Point (NADEP Cherry Point)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	3,582.3	3,820.3	3,565.9	3,565.9	3,565.9	3,565.9	3,565.9	3,565.9
Capacity	3,878.0	4,025.0	3,868.0	3,868.0	3,868.0	3,868.0	3,868.0	3,868.0
Capacity Utilization	92%	95%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%

For workload, aircraft airframes funding levels from FY01 to FY03 were increased by \$21M, with a commensurate increase in aircraft inductions. The increase is attributable to implementation of the Integrated Maintenance Concept (IMC) in the H-1 and H-53 programs. The aircraft component workload schedule increases are based on fleet requirements provided by Naval Inventory Control Point (NAVICP). The increase in funding level from FY01 to FY03 is \$42.3M. Engine workload schedules were adjusted from FY01 to FY03 due to the reprioritization of engine requirements. The funding level increased from FY01 to FY03 approximately \$19.6M.

NADEP Cherry Point will continue to improve utilization and efficiency through the use of initiatives such as Business Process Reengineering (BPR), Strategic Business Units (SBU) and ISO 9000. The FY01 total utilized capacity is based on final/actual funded workload. Between FY01 and FY02, the utilization increase of 3% is reflective of the 230,000 direct labor hour increase in the total utilized capacity. Also, the H-1 and H-53 IMC effort increases in FY02. Utilized, funded workload decreases after FY02 by 254,000 direct labor hours resulting in a three percent peacetime utilization rate decrease. Between FY03-FY08 workload and capacity data remain constant.

**Table 3-8. Naval Air Depot Jacksonville (NADEP Jacksonville)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	3,968.0	4,448.9	4,152.9	4,152.9	4,152.9	4,152.9	4,152.9	4,152.9
Capacity	4,689.0	4,787.0	4,873.0	4,873.0	4,873.0	4,873.0	4,873.0	4,873.0
Capacity Utilization	85%	93%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%

Aircraft airframes workload funding levels have remained constant, decreasing by only \$0.2M from FY01 to FY03. Aircraft inductions have increased from FY01 to FY03 primarily due to implementation of IMC in the EA-6B and H-60 programs. There is a decrease in F-14 inductions as platform retirement nears. Aircraft components increases based on fleet requirements provided by NAVICP. The increase in funding level from FY01 to FY03 is \$39.5M. Gas turbine engine workload increases from FY01 to FY03 due to the reprioritization of engine requirements. The funding level increased from FY01 to FY03 approximately \$6.0M.

For capacity, NADEP Jacksonville is implementing BPR strategies, MRP II and ISO 9000 methods and processes designed to align shop work positions to outyear workload. The FY01 total utilized capacity index is based on final/actual workload direct labor hours. The FY02 utilization index increase of just under nine percent is a result of an increase of 481,000 direct labor hours. The majority of the increase in funded workload pertains to the EA-6B and the H-60 IMC programs. After FY02 the funding level decreases by 296,000 direct labor hours, resulting in almost a nine percent peacetime utilization rate decrease. Between FY03-FY08 workload and capacity data remain constant.

**Table 3-9. Naval Air Depot North Island (NADEP North Island)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	3,974.6	4,048.5	4,012.7	4,012.7	4,012.7	4,012.7	4,012.7	4,012.7
Capacity	4,143.0	4,169.0	4,115.0	4,115.0	4,115.0	4,115.0	4,115.0	4,115.0
Capacity Utilization	96%	97%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%

For workload, Aircraft Airframes workload funding levels have remained relatively constant, increasing by only \$1.7M between FY01 and FY03. Aircraft inductions have increased from FY01 to FY03 primarily due to implementation of IMC in the H-1 and H-60 programs. The Aircraft Components workload schedule increases based on fleet requirements provided by NAVICP. There is an overall decrease in the Components funding level from FY00 to FY03 (\$8.5M). Gas turbine engine workload schedules were increased from FY01 to FY03 due to the reprioritization of engine requirements. The funding level increased from FY01 to FY03 approximately \$.2M.

For capacity, NADEP North Island continues to integrate the under utilized/duplicate equipment (work positions) review process into various BPR initiatives that promote efficiency. These reviews will continue as part of the BPR product line reviews. The FY01 total utilized capacity index is based on final/actual workload direct labor hours. The slight change in utilization from FY01 through FY03 is also a result of supplemental guidance (4 October 2001) that allows inclusion of remote or off-site capacity in the respective production shop category (PSC) or work breakdown structure (WBS) category. Aircraft inductions have increased from FY01 to FY03 primarily due to implementation of IMC in the H-1 and H-60 programs. FY01 total utilized capacity index is based on final/actual workload utilized direct labor hours. Overall, between fiscal years this data reflects fairly consistent workload levels and stable capacity. The variability of the data does not exceed one percent.

3.2.3 *Naval Sea Systems Command*

The capacity information provided for the Naval Shipyards includes both the capacity for drydocks and the capacity for output shops. The capacity utilization rates shown in this Business Profile are based on the modified drydock capacity index as provided in the DoD 4151.18-H supplemental interim instructions issued 30 September 1999 and 4 October 2001.

NAVSEA shipyard organic workload remains stable. Output capacity will fluctuate slightly as world conditions and operations dictate. In general, NAVSEA does not forecast a significant change in output shops since Navy ship cycles will not change significantly and when deployed are combat ready. Drydock capacity has not changed. This capacity index remains constant unless the number of drydocks or the maintenance strategy for the types of ships accomplished within those drydocks change. There is no forecast to change either of these factors during this reporting timeframe.

**Table 3-10. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard (NSY Portsmouth)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	4,184.5	4,608.6	4,084.0	4,249.6	4,262.1	4,381.4	4,447.3	4,062.8
Capacity	5,471.9	5,471.9	5,471.9	5,471.9	5,471.9	5,471.9	5,471.9	5,471.9
Capacity Utilization	76%	84%	75%	78%	78%	80%	81%	74%

**Table 3-11. Norfolk Naval Shipyard (NSY Norfolk)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	8,689.3	9,399.1	8,997.1	9,396.8	9,163.6	8,891.4	9,933.2	7,137.7
Capacity	9,868.6	9,868.6	9,868.6	9,868.6	9,868.6	9,868.6	9,868.6	9,868.6
Capacity Utilization	88%	95%	91%	95%	93%	90%	101%	72%

**Table 3-12. Puget Sound Naval Shipyard (NSY Puget Sound)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	10,609.0	12,326.4	11,237.7	11,082.6	11,078.3	10,757.4	11,314.9	8,785.6
Capacity	11,004.4	11,004.4	11,004.4	11,004.4	11,004.4	11,004.4	11,004.4	11,004.4
Capacity Utilization	96%	112%	102%	101%	101%	98%	103%	80%

**Table 3-13. Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard & Intermediate Maintenance Facility
(NSY/IMF Pearl Harbor)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	4,576.9	4,495.8	4,529.6	5,143.5	4,864.5	4,772.2	4,405.0	4,541.6
Capacity	5,455.2	5,455.2	5,455.2	5,455.2	5,455.2	5,455.2	5,455.2	5,455.2
Capacity Utilization	84%	82%	83%	94%	89%	87%	81%	83%

**Table 3-14. Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane Division (NSWC Crane)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	709.0	737.0	780.0	833.0	891.0	954.0	880.0	871.0
Capacity	787.0	819.0	867.0	926.0	990.0	1,062.0	978.0	967.0
Capacity Utilization	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%

FY01 data is actual data taken from financial systems. FY02-FY08 data was obtained from discussions with NSWC Crane customers. As a working capital activity, NSWC Crane competes for depot maintenance workload. Increases in workload in FY02-FY08 are primarily driven by maintenance on the EA-6B electronic warfare systems. It is not cost beneficial for NSWC Crane to maintain a surge capacity and thus it operates as close as possible to full workload.

**Table 3-15. Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division, Keyport (NUWC Keyport)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	819.0	919.0	1,003.0	1,070.0	1,140.0	1,174.0	1,152.0	1,167.0
Capacity	861.0	911.0	966.0	985.0	1,044.0	1,065.0	1,065.0	1,065.0
Capacity Utilization	95%	101%	104%	109%	109%	110%	108%	110%

Division Keyport, located in Keyport, Washington, is a shore command of the Naval Undersea Warfare Center (NUWC), Naval Sea Systems Command. NUWC Division, Keyport provides fleet material support, modernization and industrial technology with the objective of ensuring fleet material reliability. Undersea vehicles (torpedoes, targets, countermeasures and mines) are processed through shops designed with specialized equipment for disassembly, cleaning, module and component overhaul, assembly, fueling, ordnance handling, testing and environmental control of hazardous operations. Most operations are automated or computer aided and material process control data is entered at workstations throughout the shops. These shops and processes are supplemented by a light industrial capability that provides machining, plating, painting, powder coating and electronic/electrical fabrication support for maintaining material readiness. Division Keyport unique depot facilities and industrial capabilities are also used to provide maintenance technology development, rapid prototyping, and custom engineering/fabrication solutions to resolve critical fleet material needs. NUWC Division Keyport's role in depot maintenance is expanding to include partnering with NAVICP and the private sector to support fleet material current readiness requirements.

A modest increase in capacity is projected as a result of expanded facility and equipment capabilities due in part to conversion of existing non-depot capacity to support logistics agencies programs.

3.2.4 *Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command*

**Table 3-16. SPAWAR Systems Center, San Diego
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	247.0	279.0	282.0	282.0	282.0	282.0	282.0	282.0
Capacity	338.0	338.0	338.0	338.0	338.0	338.0	338.0	338.0
Capacity Utilization	73%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%	83%

**Table 3-17. SPAWAR Systems Center, Charleston
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	112.0	64.0	64.0	52.0	52.0	52.0	52.0	52.0
Capacity	135.0	92.0	92.0	92.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0
Capacity Utilization	83%	70%	70%	57%	69%	69%	69%	69%

3.2.5 *Air Force*

**Table 3-18. Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center (OC-ALC)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	8,182.0	7,871.0	8,315.0	8,796.7	8,411.0	8,050.5	8,175.4	8,005.6
Capacity	9,064.0	8,994.0	9,001.0	9,009.0	9,009.0	9,009.0	9,009.0	9,009.0
Capacity Utilization	90%	88%	92%	98%	93%	89%	91%	89%

The workload is projected to increase through FY04 due to the surge over production in the Exchangeables area. The workload is projected to decrease in the outyears due to lower aircraft workload for the KC-135, decreased engines workload for the TF33 and decreased software workload for operational flight programs (OFP) and test program sets (TPS).

OC-ALC capacity remains fairly stable through the outyears. A few of the major areas of capacity are those supporting the C-135 airframe, F100 engine, and hydraulic/pneudraulic aircraft component workloads.

**Table 3-19. Ogden Air Logistics Center (OO-ALC)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	6,281.0	6,834.0	6,877.0	7,814.9	7,774.5	7,749.5	7,644.3	7,462.8
Capacity	6,974.0	6,974.0	6,974.0	6,974.0	6,974.0	6,974.0	6,974.0	6,974.0
Capacity Utilization	90%	98%	99%	112%	111%	111%	110%	107%

The workload increase from FY01 through FY04 is due to an increase in direct product standard hours (DPSH) for electronics, power systems, struts, wheels, screw jacks, software, and aircraft. The workload will decrease in FY05 through FY08 due to a decrease in DPSH in various areas, and there is a decrease in indirect production material due to the reduction in hours. Also, there is a decrease in aircraft and missiles due to decreases in DPSH sold in the outyears. Major workloads include a new requirement for 130 units of AN/APG-68 radar programmable signal processor (PSP) for the purpose of upgrading the Block 25-42. There is an increase in the cost of aging weapon systems. There is an increase of 32 additional gas turbine engines for the generator workload.

Current capacity projections for OO-ALC are stable. Capacity levels overall were higher by approximately 8% in this capacity data submission when compared to the capacity information submitted for the previous Depot Maintenance Business Profile. This is due to the readjustment of capacity to account for the SA-ALC and SM-ALC workloads that moved to OO-ALC.

**Table 3-20. Warner Robins Air Logistics Center (WR-ALC)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	6,831.0	7,132.0	7,265.0	6,698.4	6,891.0	6,847.3	6,827.8	6,736.6
Capacity	7,600.0	7,221.0	7,088.0	7,079.0	7,023.0	7,023.0	7,023.0	7,023.0
Capacity Utilization	90%	99%	102%	95%	98%	97%	97%	96%

Business Operations reductions are included that was taken out of the 03PB. Workload hours are unstable even though customer dollars are increasing. Customer orders are down due to lower level of Depot Purchased Equipment Maintenance (DPEM) funding. The C-141 drawdown is becoming more evident. Some of the major workloads include F-15 gridlock, nose radomes, C-130 Auxiliary Power Controller (APC) paint and infrared (IR) tub overhaul, and Benchmarking initiatives including E-Web services, hardware and servers, etc.

Projections show WR-ALC total depot capacity to decrease slightly in the first few years due to the decline of the C-141 workload. The greatest impact of this change will be seen in aircraft airframe capacity. Overall however, capacity remains fairly stable. A

major portion of WR-ALC capacity supports aircraft components, much of which include avionics- and electronic-related workloads.

**Table 3-21. Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC)
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	429.0	419.0	409.0	521.3	544.5	532.4	527.7	522.8
Capacity	1,227.0	1,227.0	1,227.0	1,227.0	1,227.0	1,227.0	1,227.0	1,227.0
Capacity Utilization	35%	34%	33%	42%	44%	43%	43%	43%

Some of the major workload at AMARC from FY02 through the outyears includes F-16 aircraft for foreign military sales (FMS) for Italy. Exchangeables workload for FMS includes 28 sets of F-111 wings and Navy EF-111 parts for the EA-6B for FY02. In FY03 through the outyears, the Exchangeables FMS reclamation workload decreases while Navy and DLA reclamation requirements increases. In FY02 non-programmed maintenance storage costs increased but will decrease in the outyears due to fewer aircraft processing into storage.

This is the first year AMARC has formally reported capacity in the Depot Maintenance Business Profile since little depot level maintenance is performed at this location. Overall AMARC capacity is at sufficient levels and is not expected to change much in the outyears. Fifty seven percent of AMARC capacity is allocated for aircraft airframes. The remaining bulk of capacity supports aircraft components, in particular, instruments and aircraft structure.

3.2.6 Marine Corps

**Table 3-22. Maintenance Center Albany
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	905.0	777.0	841.0	645.0	730.0	731.0	731.0	731.0
Capacity	977.3	960.4	960.4	960.4	960.4	960.4	960.4	960.4
Capacity Utilization	93%	81%	88%	67%	76%	76%	76%	76%

The workload for Maintenance Center Albany is expected to decline in FY02 and increase in FY03 due to a budget “plus-up” for Marine Corps ground equipment. The significant increase in FY03 reflects the repair of Secondary Depot Repairables (SDRs) for ground communications and electronic equipment. The completion of the Amphibious Assault Vehicle Reliability and Maintainability – Rebuild to Standard (AAV RAM-RS) program in FY03 creates lower workload in FY04. In the outyears the increase in workload is due to automotive and engineering equipment i.e., MK48, High Speed Crane, Combat Excavator, and Medium Weight Hydraulic Excavator.

In terms of capacity, Maintenance Center Albany experienced some work position reductions from FY00 to FY01. Additional work positions reductions are planned for FY02 and the outyears to coincide with program completions such as Amphibious Assault Vehicle Reliability and Maintainability (AAVRAM) and reprogramming of M1A1 Tank. However, more efficient processes and procedures such as the implementation of ISO 9000 and Theory of Constraints (TOC) will enable MCA to meet customer expectations in quality and delivery. The TOC process is being implemented on several commodities such as the Logistics Vehicle System (LVS MK48) and the Light Armored Vehicle (LAV).

**Table 3-23. Maintenance Center Barstow
(DLH 000)**

	<u>FY01</u>	<u>FY02</u>	<u>FY03</u>	<u>FY04</u>	<u>FY05</u>	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>
Workload	1,073.0	895.0	822.0	781.0	844.0	845.0	845.0	845.0
Capacity	881.0	881.0	881.0	881.0	881.0	881.0	881.0	881.0
Capacity Utilization	122%	102%	93%	89%	96%	96%	96%	96%

The workload for Maintenance Center Barstow declines in FY02 through FY04. The FY02 decrease is due to reduced engineering equipment workload (i.e., High Speed Mobile Crane, Hydraulic Crane, Combat Excavator and Hydraulic Excavator). The FY03 decrease is due to reduced automotive (i.e., 1 ½ Ton Cargo Trailer, Water Tank Trailer and 3 ½ Ton 2 Wheeled Chassis Trailer). The completion of the AAV RAM/RS program in FY03 creates lower workload in FY04. The Medium Towed Howitzer repair requirements decline in FY04 due to fielding of the LW155. The significant increase in FY05 reflects repair of Secondary Depot Repairables (SDRs) for ground communications and electronic equipment. Beginning in FY05 and into the outyears, the increase in workload is due to automotive and engineering equipment (i.e., MK48, High Speed Crane, Combat Excavator, and Medium Weight Hydraulic Excavator).

MCLBB operates at a high level of Capacity Utilization. Conversion initiatives, divestitures and downsizing of the workforce have contributed to a 14.2% overall decrease in capacity from FY00. Amphibian capacity was downsized due to the Reliability and Maintainability Rebuild Standard (RAM-RS) nearing completion. Capacity for Ground General Purpose, Ordnance/Weapons/Munitions, Sea Systems and Special interest items all have downsized. Capacity for Missile / Missile Components, Ground Combat, Communications / Electronics Equipment, Automotive / Construction, and Tactical Vehicles have all increased.